ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.
ED002005	NA	NA

DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW

4. AUTHOR(S):
U.S. Department of Labor

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
The Economic Situation of Negroes in the United States

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
NA

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☒
FINAL ☐
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

7. EDITOR(S):	8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
NA	ORG. U.S. Department of Labor
9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE	ST.
U.S. Department of Labor Washington, D.C.	CITY, STATE Washington, D.C.

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
NA	NA	1962	35

TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA	15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
	report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)				
economic status	migration	employment practices	school desegregation	
American Negro	work-life expectancy	part-time work	public accommodations	
mobility	unemployment	trade union policies	housing	
	salary income	voting rights		

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

By 1960, Negroes constituted 10.5 percent of the population in the United States. The recent greater rate of population growth among Negroes than among whites results largely from a drop in the Negro death rate. In 1900, about 90 percent of Negroes lived in the South. Only 60 percent were still in the South by 1960, and the majority of them were in towns and cities.

Almost all men aged 25 to 54, both white and nonwhite, are in the labor force. As a result of dramatic reductions in mortality in the middle-age range, life expectancy for 20-year-old nonwhite males in the United States increased nearly 6 years from 1940-55. During the same period, work-life expectancy increased almost 4 years. Unemployment rates are generally higher among Negro than among white workers. One factor is the disproportionate number of Negroes who are in unskilled work, where unemployment is regularly heavier. Another is the frequently lower seniority ratings of Negro workers. Involuntary part-time and part-year work is more prevalent among Negroes than whites. Since earnings vary with occupation, the relative rise in Negroes' occupational levels, as well as their continuing disproportionate concentration in less skilled jobs, is reflected in their wage and salary incomes.

The United States Government maintains a policy of equal employment opportunity for all citizens, regardless of race or color. Private employment unconnected with the Government is necessarily influenced by the Federal requirement of equal opportunity in companies performing Government contracts. Federal and State laws, along with court decisions, have also ensured a measure of equality in the areas of voting rights, public accommodations, housing, and education.

ERIC No.	18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT		
	C. FUNDING DATA		
	19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. PROJECT NO.
		22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
		23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NEGRO INCOME AND EMPLOYMENT: ECONOMIC IMPACT OF SEGREGATION

ED002005

the Economic Situation of Negroes in the United States

Bulletin S-3
Revised 1962

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary

Office of Education-EEOP
Research and Materials Branch

Bennett O. Stalvey

PREFACE

The economic status of Negroes in the United States has steadily improved in recent decades. Negroes have advanced much faster on the average than other segments of the population. However, despite the narrowing of historic differentials, Negroes are still behind the majority of citizens in measures of economic well-being.

This review of the economic situation of Negroes, which revises and brings up to date a report prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1960 (Bulletin S–3), shows both the Negroes' gains and their lag. Figures cited are the most recent that could be gathered at this date; statistics from the 1960 Census of Population were not fully available when this booklet was prepared. Information for nonwhites was used whenever data did not exist for Negroes alone, since Negroes constitute over 95 percent of the nonwhite residents of the United States.

Earlier related publications by the Labor Department have included a series of booklets, also prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, entitled *Notes on the Economic Situation of Negroes in the United States*, issued in 1957, 1958, and 1959, and *Negroes in the United States, Their Employment and Economic Status* (BLS Bulletin No. 1119), published in 1952.

Office of Education-EECP
Research and Materials Branch

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	i
Population	1
Trends	1
Birth and Death Rates	1
Mobility	2
Migration	2
Employment Status	3
Labor Force Participation	3
Work-Life Expectancy	3
Unemployment	4
Part-Time Work	5
Occupation	6
Government Employment	8
Wage and Salary Income	9
Employment Policies	11
Federal Government and Government-Connected Work	11
Private Employment	15
Trade Union Policies	17
Apprenticeship	19
Voting Rights	21
1957 Civil Rights Act	21
1960 Civil Rights Act	22
Housing	23
Public Accommodation	25
Education	27
Public Elementary and Secondary Schools	27
Higher Education	31

POPULATION

Trends

In the first three decades of this century, the number of Negroes in the United States population increased less rapidly than the total population, and declined to less than one-tenth of the total. During parts of the 1940's and 1950's, however, Negroes increased faster than whites; by 1960, they constituted 10.5 percent of the population.

TABLE 1.—*Total and Negro population, 1900–60*

Year	Total population	Negro	Negro as percent of total population
1900	75,994,575	8,833,994	11.6
1910	91,972,266	9,827,763	10.7
1920	105,710,620	10,463,131	9.9
1930	122,775,046	11,891,143	9.7
1940	131,669,275	12,865,518	9.8
1950	150,697,361	15,042,286	10.0
1960	178,464,236	18,860,117	10.6
1960 [1]	179,323,175	18,871,831	10.5
	Percent increase		
1900–60	134.8	113.5	----------
1950–60	18.5	25.4	----------

[1] Including Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Birth and Death Rates

The recent greater rate of population increase among Negroes than among whites results in large measure from a drop in the Negro death rate. (For nonwhite rates, see table 2.) The birth rate has long

TABLE 2.—*Birth and death rates, white and nonwhite, 1900–60*

[Number per 1,000 population]

Year	Birth rate			Death rate		
	Total	White	Nonwhite	Total	White	Nonwhite
1900	(1)	(1)	(1)	17.2	17.0	25.0
1920	27.7	26.9	35.0	13.0	12.6	17.7
1930	21.3	20.6	27.5	11.3	10.8	16.3
1940	19.4	18.6	26.7	10.8	10.4	13.8
1950	24.1	23.0	33.3	9.6	9.5	11.2
1958	24.6	23.4	34.2	9.5	9.4	10.2
1959	24.3	23.1	34.0	9.4	9.4	9.9
1960	23.7	22.7	32.1	9.5	9.4	10.0

[1] Not available.

NOTE.—Birth rates, except 1960, have been adjusted for underregistration.

Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Public Health Service.

been higher among nonwhites than among whites, but a higher death rate kept the nonwhite population at a constant proportion of the total. The death rate of nonwhites has been rapidly reduced, however, and by 1960 it was very little higher than that of whites. The increase in the proportion of Negroes, noted above, reflects this trend.

Mobility

Nonwhites tend to move from house to house more often than whites. (For notes on home ownership, which may influence mobility, see p. 23.) Longer moves, from one State to another, have recently been somewhat more frequent among whites. Between 1940 and 1947, however, as shown in table 3, great numbers of nonwhites moved to a different State.

TABLE 3.—*Mobility: Percent migrating between States, selected periods, 1935–60*

	Percent of whites	Percent of nonwhites
1935–40	5.5	3.9
1940–47	9.7	14.1
1955–60	9.2	6.1

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Migration

In 1900, about 90 percent of Negroes lived in the South, largely in rural areas (table 4). By 1960, only 60 percent were still in the South, and the majority of them were in towns and cities. Some 38 percent were in urban areas in the North or West. Only about one-fourth remained on farms, nearly all in the South.

For analysis of a long range of census data on population by color, by region, see: Irene B. Taeuber, "Migration, Mobility, and the Assimilation of the Negro," in *Population Bulletin*, November 1958, pp. 127–51 (reprint).

TABLE 4.—*Negroes in the South and in remainder of the United States, urban and rural areas, 1900 and 1960*

Area	1900	1960
United States	100.0	100.0
South	89.7	59.9
Urban	15.4	35.0
Rural	74.2	24.9
Remainder of the United States	10.3	40.1
Urban	7.2	38.2
Rural	3.1	1.9

NOTE.—Definitions of rural and urban are only roughly comparable at the two periods.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Labor Force Participation

Almost all men aged 25 to 54, both white and nonwhite, are in the labor force (table 5). In some other groups—adult women and younger and older men—relatively more nonwhites than whites have traditionally sought jobs. However, these differences are not as great as they were a few years ago. A major factor in reducing the differences has been the exodus of Negroes from sharecropping and other small-scale farming where, more than in other types of enterprise, the very young and the very old tend to be at work. In addition, the proportion of nonwhites enrolled in school, and hence out of the labor market, has increased more rapidly than for white youth.

TABLE 5.—*Percent of the civilian population in the labor force, by color, age, and sex, annual averages 1951 and 1961*

Age	Male				Female			
	White		Nonwhite		White		Nonwhite	
	1951	1961	1951	1961	1951	1961	1951	1961
Total, 14 and over	84.0	79.6	83.7	78.0	32.6	35.8	44.9	45.1
14–19	49.2	41.7	55.3	41.5	32.5	30.5	28.9	24.6
20–24	88.4	87.6	88.7	89.8	46.7	46.9	45.4	47.6
25–34	97.0	97.7	95.7	96.0	33.6	34.3	51.1	51.2
35–44	97.6	97.9	96.4	94.9	38.0	41.8	55.8	60.5
45–54	96.0	95.9	95.1	92.3	38.0	48.9	55.5	61.0
55–64	87.4	87.8	84.6	81.6	26.8	37.2	39.8	45.2
65 and over	44.5	31.9	49.5	29.5	8.5	10.5	14.0	13.1

NOTE.—Figures exclude persons in institutions.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, and U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Work-Life Expectancy

As a result of a dramatic reduction in mortality in the middle age range, life expectancy for 20-year-old nonwhite males in the United States increased from 39.8 in 1940 to 45.5 in 1955—an increase of nearly 6 years. During the same period, work-life expectancy increased from 36.2 years to 40 years—an increase of almost 4 years (table 6).

With these developments, the number of years spent in retirement (the difference between life expectancy and work-life expectancy at age 20) increased from 3.6 to 5.5 years. There are two main reasons

for this trend: A much larger proportion of nonwhites lived beyond retirement age in 1955 than in 1940; and increased liberalization of social security provisions and the continuation of the off-farm movement resulted in earlier retirement.

Increases in both life expectancy and work-life expectancy were greater for nonwhites than for whites from 1940 to 1955. Life expectancy for 20-year-old nonwhite men increased 5.7 years, compared with 2.4 years for white men. Similarly, work-life expectancy increased 3.8 years for nonwhite men and 1.6 years for white men. Largely because a greater proportion of nonwhite men now live beyond retirement age, the retirement life expectancy for nonwhites has also increased more rapidly than for white men—1.9 years compared with 0.8 years.

Despite their much greater increase in life expectancy, nonwhite males aged 20 in 1955 still had a 4.6-year shorter expectancy than had whites.

TABLE 6.—*Average number of remaining years of life, in labor force and in retirement, males, by color, 1940 and 1955*

Age and color	1940			1955		
	Total	In labor force	In retirement	Total	In labor force	In retirement
At age 20:						
White	47.7	41.8	5.9	50.1	43.4	6.7
Nonwhite	39.8	36.2	3.6	45.5	40.0	5.5
At age 40:						
White	30.1	24.0	6.1	31.7	24.8	6.9
Nonwhite	25.4	21.3	4.1	28.6	22.8	5.8
At age 60:						
White	15.1	9.1	6.0	16.0	9.5	6.5
Nonwhite	14.6	9.5	5.1	15.4	9.6	5.8

Source: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Vital Statistics, and U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Unemployment

Unemployment rates are generally higher among Negro than among white workers. One factor is the disproportionate number of Negroes who are in unskilled work (table 10), where unemployment is regularly heavier. Another is the frequently lower seniority ratings of Negro workers, because of their more recent entry into factory and office work.

In the 1953 downturn, unemployment rates rose in all groups, and continued to be roughly twice as high among nonwhite as among white men. Nearly 14 percent of the nonwhite male workers, a large proportion of them from unskilled and semiskilled occupations, were unemployed and seeking work in 1958, compared with an average of about 6 percent of whites (table 7). By 1961, both rates were lower, but nearly 13 percent of nonwhite men were still unemployed, compared with 5.7 percent of whites.

TABLE 7.—*Employment status of the civilian population age 14 and over, by color and sex, annual averages 1958–61*

[Numbers in thousands]

Employment status	White				Nonwhite			
	1958	1959	1960	1961	1958	1959	1960	1961
	Men							
Civilian population	51,262	51,868	52,567	53,527	5,611	5,713	5,952	6,080
Civilian labor force	41,686	41,993	42,297	42,635	4,511	4,568	4,728	4,743
Employed	39,151	40,047	40,265	40,185	3,891	4,041	4,220	4,133
Agriculture	4,178	4,113	4,020	3,871	624	635	657	636
Nonagricultural industries	34,973	35,934	36,244	36,314	3,267	3,405	3,563	3,497
Unemployed	2,536	1,945	2,032	2,450	619	527	508	610
	Women							
Civilian population	56,067	56,755	57,610	58,781	6,374	6,478	6,726	6,891
Civilian labor force	19,508	19,863	20,471	21,044	2,943	2,970	3,116	3,180
Employed	18,300	18,804	19,376	19,675	2,623	2,689	2,821	2,803
Agriculture	790	815	768	728	252	273	277	227
Nonagricultural industries	17,510	17,989	18,608	18,947	2,371	2,416	2,544	2,576
Unemployed	1,208	1,059	1,095	1,369	318	281	295	377
	Percent							
Labor force as percent of civilian population:								
Men	81.3	81.0	80.5	79.7	80.4	79.1	79.4	78.0
Women	34.8	35.0	35.5	35.8	46.2	45.8	46.3	46.1
Unemployed as percent of labor force:								
Men	6.1	4.6	4.8	5.7	13.7	11.5	10.7	12.9
Women	6.2	5.3	5.3	6.5	10.8	9.5	9.5	11.9

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, and U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Unemployment rates vary with age in both white and Negro groups. In 1961, with 5.7 percent of all white males unemployed, unemployment at ages 14–17 and 18–19 was above 13 and 15 percent, respectively (table 8). But about one-fourth of young nonwhites, girls as well as boys, were unemployed.

TABLE 8.—*Unemployed as percent of civilian labor force, by age, annual average, 1961*

Age	Male		Female	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Total, 14 years and over	5.7	12.9	6.5	11.9
14–17 years	13.3	25.5	13.3	24.6
18 and 19 years	15.2	23.8	13.6	28.1
20–24 years	10.1	15.3	8.4	19.6
25–34 years	4.9	12.9	6.6	11.1
35–44 years	4.0	10.7	5.6	10.7
45–54 years	4.4	10.2	4.8	7.4
55–64 years	5.3	10.5	4.3	6.6
65 years and over	5.2	9.2	3.8	6.5

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Part-Time Work

Involuntary part-time and part-year work are more prevalent among Negroes than whites (table 9). Differences are probably due

in large measure to the greater concentration of Negroes in the less skilled occupations (table 10) and to their generally lower seniority ratings because of their more recent entry into factory and office work.

Many women workers prefer part- rather than full-time work. About a fifth, both white and nonwhite, were reported in 1961 as usually working part time because of the demands of home housework, or for other noneconomic reasons.

TABLE 9.—*Persons at work in nonagricultural industries by full- or part-time status, by color and sex, annual average, 1961*

Hours worked, usual status, and sex	White	Nonwhite
Men	*Percent*	*Percent*
Total at work	100.0	100.0
35 hours or more	87.2	80.9
1-34 hours	12.8	19.1
Usually work full time at present job	5.7	9.1
Worked part time for economic reasons	2.1	3.9
Worked part time for other reasons	3.6	5.1
Usually work part time at present job	7.2	10.1
Worked part time for economic reasons	1.6	6.0
Worked part time for other reasons	5.5	4.0
Average hours	42.8	39.5
Women		
Total at work	100.0	100.0
35 hours or more	71.1	64.0
1-34 hours	28.9	36.0
Usually work full time at present job	5.8	6.1
Worked part time for economic reasons	2.1	2.7
Worked part time for other reasons	3.7	3.4
Usually work part time at present job	23.0	29.9
Worked part time for economic reasons	2.6	11.5
Worked part time for other reasons	20.4	18.3
Average hours	35.7	33.9

NOTE.—"Economic reasons" include: Slack work, material shortages, repairs to plant or equipment, start or termination of job during the week, and inability to find full-time work. "Other reasons" include: Labor dispute, bad weather, own illness, vacation, demands of home housework, school, etc., no desire for full-time work, full-time worker only during peak season, and other such reasons.

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Occupation

Occupational differences between Negroes and whites are still large, but Negroes have raised their occupational levels appreciably faster, in the past 22 years, than whites.

In 1962, more than a fourth of the white males working—but only 8 percent of the nonwhites—were in professional or managerial occupations outside of agriculture (table 10). Well over half the nonwhite men were in nonfarm manual occupations, but only 9 percent were skilled craftsmen or foremen, as against nearly 20 percent of the whites. More than 15 percent of the nonwhite men were in service occupations, and almost as many were still doing farmwork, compared with about 6 and 9 percent for the whites. Many of those in agriculture, both white and nonwhite, were operating their own farms, but the percentage of farm laborers was greater among nonwhites.

These percentages represent a gain in occupational status for both white and nonwhite men, but particularly for the latter. In the skilled and semiskilled blue-collar occupations there has been no marked change in the past few years, but Negroes have generally held on to the gains made during World War II, when many moved into the semiskilled factory operative and related occupations halfway up the skill ladder.

The percent of nonwhite men working as skilled craftsmen or foremen more than doubled between 1940 and 1962, as did the percentage in professional and technical occupations and the percent of nonfarm managers, officials, etc. In each of these groups, nonwhites gained faster than whites. Probably some of the Negro men who left the farm became unskilled laborers in urban areas, but the rise in the percentage at such work was small; the percent in service jobs was virtually unchanged.

The most common occupation of nonwhite women in 1962, as in 1940, was domestic service work. However, the number at such

TABLE 10.—*Distribution of employed persons by major occupation group, color, and sex, April 1940 and April 1962*

Major occupation group and sex	Number (thousands)		Percent			
	White	Nonwhite	White		Nonwhite	
	1962		1940	1962	1940	1962
Males						
Total	40,104	4,079	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	4,924	181	5.9	12.3	1.9	4.4
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	6,119	157	10.6	15.3	1.6	3.8
Clerical and kindred workers	2,891	255	7.1	7.2	1.2	6.2
Sales workers	2,576	65	6.7	6.4	.9	1.6
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	7,982	367	15.5	19.9	4.4	9.0
Operatives and kindred workers	7,497	968	18.8	18.7	12.2	23.7
Laborers, except farm and mine	2,352	895	7.5	5.9	20.5	21.9
Service workers, except private household	2,305	600	5.8	5.7	12.4	14.7
Private household workers	27	22	.2	.1	2.9	.5
Farmers and farm managers	2,379	221	14.0	5.9	21.3	5.4
Farm laborers and foremen	1,052	349	6.8	2.6	19.9	8.6
Occupation not reported	--------	--------	1.0	--------	.7	--------
Females						
Total	19,914	2,727	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	2,740	201	14.3	13.8	4.3	7.4
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	1,103	45	4.3	5.5	.8	1.7
Clerical and kindred workers	6,669	279	24.6	33.5	1.0	10.2
Sales workers	1,625	61	8.0	8.2	.6	2.2
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	220	18	1.2	1.1	.2	.7
Operatives and kindred workers	2,891	397	20.2	14.5	6.6	14.6
Laborers, except farm and mine	90	22	.9	.5	.9	.8
Service workers, except private household	2,752	613	11.3	13.8	10.5	22.5
Private household workers	1,259	1,016	10.8	6.3	58.0	37.3
Farmers and farm managers	130	7	1.2	.7	3.2	.3
Farm laborers and foremen	437	66	1.2	2.2	12.8	2.4
Occupation not reported	--------	--------	2.0	--------	1.1	--------

NOTE.—1962 estimates are not completely comparable with 1940.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, and U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

work fell from 58 to 37 percent of nonwhite women workers. The number of women in service work outside private households rose above 22 percent, and the number of factory operatives to almost 15 percent—more than double in each case. Far more of the nonwhite women were clerical workers by 1962, though they still constituted only a fraction of the percentage among whites. A big drop occurred in the percent of nonwhite women doing farmwork.

These shifts resulted by April 1962 in giving nonwhite men many more of the semiskilled factory operative and the clerical jobs, and more of the professional and technical, managerial, crafts and foreman, and sales jobs (table 11). There were also relatively more nonwhite laborers and service workers in 1962 than in 1940. Nonwhites had left the farms, meanwhile, in relatively greater numbers than whites.

TABLE 11.—*Nonwhite employment as percent of total employment in each major occupation group, by sex, April 1940 and April 1962*

Major occupation group	Nonwhite men as percent of employed men		Nonwhite women as percent of employed women	
	1940	1962	1940	1962
Total employed	9.0	9.2	13.9	12.0
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	3.1	3.5	4.6	6.8
Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm	1.5	2.5	2.8	3.9
Clerical and kindred workers	1.6	8.1	0.7	4.0
Sales workers	1.4	2.5	1.1	3.6
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	2.7	4.4	2.3	7.6
Operatives and kindred workers	6.1	11.4	5.0	12.1
Laborers, except farm and mine	21.2	27.6	(1)	(1)
Service workers, except private household	17.4	20.7	13.1	18.2
Private household workers	(1)	(1)	46.5	44.7
Farmers and farm managers	13.1	8.5	30.2	5.1
Farm laborers and foremen	22.5	24.9	62.9	13.1

[1] Figures not shown where base in either year is less than 100,000.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, and U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Government Employment

The number of nonwhites working in Federal, State, and local government rose from 214,000 in 1940 to over 1 million in 1962, a fivefold increase. The proportion of nonwhites to all government employees rose from 5.6 to 12.1 percent. Estimated government employment in April of selected years was as follows: [1]

	1940	1956	1960	1961	1962
Government employees, total	3,845,000	6,919,000	8,014,000	8,150,000	8,647,000
Nonwhites employed in government	214,000	670,000	855,000	932,000	1,046,000
Nonwhite as percent of total	5.6	9.7	10.7	11.4	12.1

In mid-1961, nonwhites constituted 11.5 percent of the United States population.

[1] Figures cover all government services, including blue-collar work done directly by government agencies and teaching.

WAGE AND SALARY INCOME

Since earnings vary with occupation, the relative rise in Negroes' occupational levels (table 10), as well as their continuing disproportionate concentration in the less skilled jobs, is reflected in their earnings. Whites average higher earnings than Negroes, but the gap is somewhat less wide than in earlier years. In 1939, nonwhite male workers earned, on the average, about 41 percent as much as whites; by 1960, nearly 60 percent. The corresponding percentages for nonwhite female workers were about 36 and 50 (table 12).

These averages are reduced by the inclusion of many part-time or part-year workers. If figures are limited to those who worked a full year, nonwhites do relatively better. For full-year full-time work, nonwhite males in 1960 averaged $3,789, which was about 67 percent of the rate for white males.

When family rather than individual incomes are compared, the Negro-white difference is somewhat less, as a higher proportion of Negro family members are in the labor force.

TABLE 12.—*Median wage and salary incomes of white and nonwhite persons, 1939–60*

Year	Male		Female		Nonwhite as percent of white	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	Male	Female
All persons with wage or salary income:						
1939	$1,112	$460	$676	$246	41.4	36.4
1947	2,357	1,279	1,269	432	54.3	34.0
1957	4,396	2,436	2,240	1,019	55.4	45.5
1958	4,569	2,652	2,364	1,055	58.0	44.6
1959	4,902	2,844	2,422	1,289	58.0	53.2
1960	5,137	3,075	2,537	1,276	59.9	50.3
Year-round full-time workers with wage or salary income:						
1939	1,419	639	863	327	45.0	37.9
1957	4,950	3,137	3,107	1,866	63.4	60.1
1958	5,186	3,368	3,225	1,988	64.9	61.6
1959	5,456	3,339	3,306	2,196	61.2	66.4
1960	5,662	3,789	3,410	2,372	66.9	69.6

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

EMPLOYMENT POLICIES

Federal Government and Government-Connected Work

The United States Government maintains a policy of equal employment opportunity for all citizens, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. This equal opportunity policy applies both to employment in Federal agencies and to employment by private agencies performing Government contracts.

Although discrimination has been implicitly prohibited since the passage of the Civil Service Act of 1883, which provided that appointments were to be made "with sole reference to merit and fitness," special steps were taken in 1940 to assure equal treatment for all in Government jobs. The Ramspeck Act, barring racial discrimination in Federal service, and an Executive order of November 7, 1940, dealt with questions of application and hiring. On January 10, 1941, the Civil Service Commission took an additional step to prevent a possible means of discrimination, when it deleted from its forms the question regarding race and discontinued the use of the photograph in applications.

Executive Order 8802 of June 1941 established the Fair Employment Practice Committee, and Executive Order 9980 in 1948 set up a Fair Employment Board at the Civil Service Commission to review complaints of discrimination.

In January 1955, Executive Order 10590 created the President's Committee on Government Employment Policy to help Federal agencies carry out the policy of equal opportunity in Federal service without discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

The Federal Government has also taken a series of actions to assure equality of treatment in work under Government contracts. Executive Order 8802 of 1941 affirmed a policy of full participation in the defense program by all persons, regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin. It ordered contracting agencies of the Federal Government to include in each defense contract a provision obligating the contractor to a policy of equal employment opportunity. A Fair Employment Practice Committee was set up to implement this policy.

Executive Order 9346 of May 27, 1943, reaffirmed the policy of nondiscrimination in Government contracts, extending it to cover apprenticeship, and established a seven-member committee in the Office of Emergency Management to enforce the policy. This order

expired after the war. In December 1951, a Committee on Government Contract Compliance came into being with Executive Order 10308; this Committee had advisory and educational functions, but no enforcement power.

The Committee was ended with the establishment of the President's Committee on Government Contracts in August 1953. The new group was charged with strengthening enforcement of the nondiscrimination clauses in Federal contracts. Executive Order 10557 of September 3, 1954, supplied a standard nondiscrimination provision and ordered it included in all future contracts.

President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. Concluding that a single committee could work more effectively toward the goal of equal employment opportunity, President John F. Kennedy, on March 6, 1961, issued Executive Order 10925 combining the old Committees on Government Employment Policy and Government Contracts into a single President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

In issuing the order, the President emphasized that the expanded and strengthened Committee, which became operative on April 7, 1961, would have widespread responsibilities and authority in seeking to eliminate discrimination from Government-connected work. The Executive order charged the Committee with the duty to "promote and ensure equal opportunity for all qualified persons, without regard to race, creed, color, or national origin, employed or seeking employment with the Federal Government and on Government contracts."

The order calls for a clause to be included in each Federal Government contract, stipulating that the contractor will not practice discrimination in employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer, recruitment or recruitment advertising, layoff or termination, rates of pay or other forms of compensation, or selection for training, including apprenticeship. Labor unions and other employee representatives are expected to comply with the purposes of the order. The Committee, working with the contracting agencies, checks compliance and encourages nondiscriminatory employment practices. The order gives the Committee authority to establish educational programs, to hold public hearings, and to bring sanctions to bear in case of noncompliance.

Unlike its predecessors, the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity is given strong enforcement authority. It may publish the names of contractors or unions which it concludes have complied or have failed to comply with the Executive order's provisions, rules, and regulations, or with Committee orders. It may recommend to the Department of Justice that appropriate proceedings be brought to enforce the provisions. If false information is furnished to any contracting agency or to the Committee, it may recommend criminal proceedings. It may terminate a contract, or cause it to be terminated, if the contractor or subcontractor fails to comply with the

nondiscrimination clause of the contract. It may further provide that the contracting agency shall refrain from entering into future contracts with the noncomplying contractor. While none of these sanctions are brought to bear until every reasonable effort has been made to secure compliance, the Committee is armed with enough enforcement authority to assure that public funds will not be spent to support employment discrimination.

President Kennedy named Vice President Lyndon Johnson chairman of the Committee, and the Secretary of Labor vice chairman. The Committee membership includes the heads of major Federal agencies, and representative private citizens from business, labor, and religious organizations.

The Committee program is divided into two parts, one dealing with Federal Government employment, the other with Government contract employment.

In the first 6 months of operation, the Committee received 534 complaints of discrimination in Government employment. Investigation of many of the cases failed to find discrimination; where discrimination was found, proper adjustment was made.

Complaints, however, are merely symptomatic. As a means toward affirmative action, the Committee undertook a survey of the employment patterns in all executive agencies. From this survey, the Committee is identifying and seeking to correct discrimination areas before individual complaints become necessary.

A complaint system has been established also for Government contract employment. In the first 6 months, the Committee received 298 complaints of discrimination in contract jobs. As in Government employment, adjustments were made where the complaints were justified.

In the contract employment, likewise, the Committee is taking a positive approach, one aspect of which is the Plan for Progress program. During the first half year of operation, the Committee signed individual Plans for Progress with nine of the Nation's largest defense contractors. These plans—covering more than 800,000 employees—spell out in detail the steps the companies will take to assure equal opportunity for their employees and applicants for employment. The plans are voluntary, and are undertaken only after a company has completely surveyed its employment situation and has designed effective methods to insure equal opportunities. The Committee anticipates signing Plans for Progress with other major contractors.

The Plans for Progress being carried out by the contractors in cooperation with the Committee call for such positive actions as company information programs on the equal opportunity policy through discussions with supervisory personnel, employee handbooks, posters, notices, and other company publications. The companies are also

undertaking to publicize the policy in their communities. They are actively recruiting applicants from among minority groups, working with minority group organizations, and participating in programs to encourage training of minority group members for better positions.

Negroes in the Armed Forces. During the period 1940 to 1954, Negroes were first included in the Armed Forces in segregated units, then gradually integrated. By 1954, all-Negro units in the Armed Forces had been dissolved, in accordance with the President's Executive Order No. 9981 of July 26, 1948, which had announced a policy of "equality of treatment and opportunity for all persons in the armed services without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin." Integrated activities by 1954 included organization, assignment, training, billeting, mess, supervised recreation, and all other unit operations, as well as on-post schooling of dependents of military personnel. A report of the Committee on Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Services, created by the same Executive order, appeared in 1950 under the title *Freedom to Serve.*

A new Committee on Equality of Opportunity in the Armed Forces was appointed by the President on June 22, 1962, to consider the following questions:

1. What measures should be taken to improve the effectiveness of current policies and procedures in the Armed Forces with regard to equality of treatment and opportunity for persons in the Armed Forces?
2. What measures should be employed to improve equality of opportunity for members of the Armed Forces and their dependents in the civilian community, particularly with respect to housing, education, transportation, recreational facilities, community events, programs, and activities?

With the advance of the program, complete statistics are no longer kept on a racial basis. Negroes are found in all types of assignment throughout the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. The Defense Department's March 1962 report, *Integration and the Negro Officer in the Armed Forces of the United States of America,* provides nonstatistical information. Enrollment at the academies in the fall of 1961 included the following numbers of Negro cadets: Military Academy, 14; Naval Academy, 12; Air Force Academy, 10.

Civilian components, enrolling personnel not on active military duty, present a special problem. They tend to reflect local customs, and their racial pattern varies. Some of the largest all-white and all-Negro units are the ROTC units on college campuses, where they reflect the composition of the student body, and are beyond the direct control of the military. Georgia, Mississippi, and Arkansas are the only States in which the qualified Negro college student cannot enroll in any ROTC unit.

The National Guard and the Organized Reserves, as civilian components, likewise present a mixed picture, in law and in fact, in the different States. By 1960, 15 States had laws that more or less strictly barred segregation in the National Guard. Many States had no law on the subject, but in theory did not segregate the Guard; practice varied. Some States enlisted Negroes, but in segregated units; others excluded Negroes from the Guard altogether.

Orders now in force are designed to bring to an end remaining racial differences in the civilian components and to implement the Defense Department's policy of equal treatment and opportunity for all personnel.

Private Employment

In addition to its work in Federal agencies and with Government contractors, the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity has launched an educational program aimed at promoting the concept of equal employment opportunity and at eliminating the basic causes of discrimination in employment.

Private employment unconnected with the Government is necessarily influenced by the Federal requirement of equal opportunity in companies performing Government contracts; in addition, numerous public and private agencies are active in the private employment field.

Minority Groups Program. The U.S. Labor Department's Bureau of Employment Security operates a minority groups program through the U.S. Employment Service and affiliated agencies in the States. The purpose of the program—to promote the employment of minority group workers on the basis of their skill, ability, and performance on the job—is furthered through education and cooperation with other agencies. Staffs of the State employment agencies are instructed as to the special problems of minority groups and methods for dealing with them. Local offices of the Employment Service advise employers that job offers specifying race, creed, or other attributes unconnected with work performance cannot be filled. The office tries to persuade the employer to accept the best qualified candidate, regardless of creed or color.

State Actions on Fair Employment. By July 1962, 20 States, having 60 percent of the U.S. population and nearly 40 percent of the Nation's Negro population, had passed enforceable fair employment practice laws designed to end discrimination in private employment (table 13). Two other States, Indiana and Idaho, had fair employment practice laws, but without enforcement provisions. Many of the State fair employment practice commissions are charged with enforcing nondiscrimination regulations in public accommodation, housing, or education as well as in employment.

TABLE 13.—*The States and measures against discrimination, as of July 1962*

State	Negroes as percent of population, 1960	Enforceable fair employment practice law	Law against discrimination in				Integration of public schools			
			Housing			Public accommodation	Complete[1]	Substantial	Begun	None
			Public	Publicly aided	Private					
New England:										
Maine	0.3					X	X			
New Hampshire	.3				X[2]	X	X			
Vermont	.1					X	X			
Massachusetts	2.2	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Rhode Island	2.1	X	X			X	X			
Connecticut	4.2	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Middle Atlantic:										
New York	8.4	X	X	X	X	X	X			
New Jersey	8.5	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Pennsylvania	7.5	X	X	X	X	X	X			
East North Central:										
Ohio	8.1	X				X	X			
Indiana	5.8		X	X[3]		X	X			
Illinois	10.3	X		X[3]		X	X			
Michigan	9.2	X	X			X	X			
Wisconsin	1.9	X	X	X		X	X			
West North Central:										
Minnesota	.7	X	X	X	X	X	X			
Iowa	.9					X	X			
Missouri	9.0	X						X		
North Dakota	.1					X	X			
South Dakota	.2						X			
Nebraska	2.1					X	X			
Kansas	4.2	X				X	X			
South Atlantic:										
Delaware	13.6	X						X		
Maryland	16.7							X		
District of Columbia	53.9					X	X			
Virginia	20.6								X	
West Virginia	4.8							X		
North Carolina	24.5								X	
South Carolina	34.8									X
Georgia	28.5								X	
Florida	17.8								X	
East South Central:										
Kentucky	7.1							X		
Tennessee	16.5								X	
Alabama	30.0									X
Mississippi	42.0									X
West South Central:										
Arkansas	21.8								X	
Louisiana	31.9								X	
Oklahoma	6.6							X		
Texas	12.4							X		
Mountain:										
Montana	.2			X[3]		X	X			
Idaho	.2					X	X			
Wyoming	.7					X	X			
Colorado	2.3	X	X	X	X	X	X			
New Mexico	1.8	X				X	X			
Arizona	3.3						X			
Utah	.5						X			
Nevada	4.7						X			
Pacific:										
Washington	1.7	X	X	X		X	X			
Oregon	1.0	X	X	X	X	X	X			
California	5.6	X	X	X		X	X			
Alaska	3.0	X				X	X			
Hawaii	.8						X			

[1] Complete in theory. However, some schools in northern and western States have been found in fact to be segregated. While most such practices are believed to have been stopped, a number of suits still before the courts in mid-1962 alleged discrimination of various kinds. See page 30 for further details.

[2] Private rental housing only.

[3] Urban redevelopment housing only.

NOTE.—For more detailed information, see: Milton R. Konvitz and Theodore Leskes, *A Century of Civil Rights*. New York, Columbia University Press, 1961. 293 pp.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1960 Census of Population*, and U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

As a rule, the State law creates a commission having enforcement power. In practice, however, the commissions proceed largely through public education, following their investigation of a complaint with an attempt to persuade the offender to end the practice complained of. If necessary, a formal hearing can be held. After a hearing the commission may issue an order, and this order may be enforced if necessary through the courts. Few cases in any State, however, reach the stage of formal hearing, and very few reach the courts. The commissions depend largely on education and conciliation; they claim to have achieved good results by these means.

Trade Union Policies

Discrimination because of race is a problem in the labor movement, as elsewhere in American life. It is a problem to which labor leaders are vigorously addressing themselves.[2] As AFL–CIO President George Meany observed on March 26, 1960:

> I think the record proves we have come a long way. Many of our older unions were born and grew up in an earlier and less enlightened period. They reflected the attitudes of their communities—prejudice based on ignorance. Discrimination was not only accepted; it was respectable. It is a measure of our progress that where discrimination still survives in the labor movement, it is a bootleg product, sneaked in by subterfuge. Even those who practice discrimination know that its days are numbered.

The constitution of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, adopted in December 1955, lists among its objectives: "To encourage all workers without regard to race, creed, color, national origin or ancestry to share equally in the full benefits of union organization." To further this objective, the AFL–CIO established a Civil Rights Committee and a Civil Rights Department. It is their function to help the Executive Council "bring about at the earliest possible date the effective implementation of the principle . . . of nondiscrimination in accordance with the provisions of this constitution."

The most recent AFL–CIO convention, in December 1961, gave the Civil Rights Committee the right to initiate complaints as well as to process them, and established a step-by-step compliance procedure under which unadjusted cases will reach the Executive Council. The resolution also: Called upon affiliated unions to eliminate segregated locals; urged the removal from all union contracts of separate seniority lists, etc., based on race, religion, or national origin; asked

---

[2] See U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *A Guide to Labor-Management Relations in the United States* (Bulletin No. 1225, March 1958), section 2:14, Equal Job Opportunities under Collective Bargaining, for a description of important aspects of job equality.

unions to make a special effort to negotiate nondiscrimination clauses in their contracts and to abolish discrimination in apprenticeship programs; and instructed the AFL–CIO Civil Rights Department to bring complaints to the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity when there has not been an effective collective bargaining effort to correct racial discrimination.

The resolution noted a number of examples of recent progress. Central labor bodies in Philadelphia, Chicago, and New York, and in Wisconsin have organized "civil rights inventories." Actors' Equity Association policy, supported by the International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees, opposes performances in segregated facilities. The United Automobile Workers took prompt action against a southern local having segregated facilities in its union hall. The District Council of Carpenters in Miami filed a formal complaint with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, when local contractors on a Federal project refused to hire qualified Negro carpenters.

Increased awareness of the issue by labor and management, stimulated perhaps by enforcement of Government contract policies and State and local fair employment laws, is likely to encourage inclusion of antidiscrimination clauses in additional collective bargaining agreements. The United Steelworkers of America, for example, negotiated such clauses in 1962 with all the major steel producers; previously, only two of the major producers had signed such provisions. A survey of major agreements in effect in 1961 showed that about one-fifth contained specific bans against discrimination because of race, color, or national origin.[3] Such agreements were found chiefly in manufacturing industries, particularly durable-goods manufacturing, and where the union involved had a civil rights department or committee. About one-third of the provisions had been negotiated by locals of the Automobile Workers or the Electrical Workers (IUE).

While any collective bargaining agreement applies equally, of course, to all workers covered by it, an antidiscrimination clause does serve a purpose. It emphasizes the legal obligation that exists; it is a constant reminder to management and union representatives involved in administration of an agreement; and it encourages members of minority groups to assert their rights with vigor. (Obviously, the absence of an antidiscrimination provision in a contract does not necessarily imply nonobservance.)

Despite large numbers of actions of the types cited, many union locals still discriminate in some way against Negroes. Some refuse them membership; some organize Negroes, but in separate locals; some craft unions prevent young Negroes from entering highly skilled

---

[3] Leon E. Lunden, "Antidiscrimination Provisions in Major Contracts, 1961," *in Monthly Labor Review*, June 1962, pp. 643–651. For examples of provisions in union constitutions, see Bureau of Labor Statistics Bulletin 1336, same title.

trades by barring them from apprenticeships (see below). The AFL–CIO convention in December 1961, while noting "solid progress" in the previous 2 years, went on to resolve that:

> Serious shortcomings and deficiencies still persist. . . . The still unfinished task of winning full and general acceptance of nondiscrimination is a challenge to every trade unionist and to every local in our ranks.

Apprenticeship

Special problems are involved in apprenticeship. Many apprenticeships are jointly planned by management and trade unions. The most effective programs are administered by joint apprenticeship committees which are composed of equal representation of management and labor.

Although full information is lacking, available studies make it clear that Negroes and other minority groups have not been entering skilled trades apprenticeship programs to a satisfactory degree. There are trades in many parts of the country in which no Negroes are enrolled in apprenticeship programs.[4]

Nevertheless, there are many examples of unions formulating positive programs to insure the recruitment of minority group youth for apprenticeship programs.

District 9 of the Painters Union in New York City invites community agencies such as settlement houses and the Urban League to spread the word that minority group youth will find opportunities in their joint apprenticeship programs. The result has been that some 90 out of approximately 130 apprentices under training in that program in 1962 were Negroes or Puerto Ricans.

Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers in New York City, as part of the agreement settling its 1962 negotiations for a shorter workweek with the contractors, agreed to take 1,000 new apprentices into membership. The joint apprenticeship committee let it be known that there were openings for at least several hundred minority group youth in this apprenticeship program. It has also put the selection in the hands of a Columbia University professor to insure an objective selection for these new apprenticeship openings.

The Bricklayers, Masons and Plasterers' International Union, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, and other unions

---

[4] Many causes besides race prejudice operate to keep young Negroes out of apprenticeships. Historically, many have lacked the generally required high school diploma. As this has been gained, many young Negroes (and whites as well) have preferred white-collar work. The young men most likely to enter apprenticeship are those whose older relatives are already working in the skilled trades; they are in a position to know of openings, which may be rare, and to understand the kind of career that may be expected to follow apprenticeship. Since comparatively fewer Negroes are in the skilled trades, this kind of connection is not open to many youths, and the lure of higher immediate earnings in an unskilled job may prevail. The fact that many [illegible]es admit very few apprentices makes it especially hard for members of minority groups to enter.

have succeeded, in nationwide agreements with their employer associations, in making nondiscrimination a feature of their apprenticeship programs. The California Labor Federation and the Greater Los Angeles Central Labor Union took the initiative, in cooperation with appropriate government agencies, in the policy of insuring equal opportunity in apprenticeship. By early 1962, according to an AFL–CIO official, nondiscrimination clauses had been negotiated in more than 600 local apprenticeship agreements, chiefly in the building trades. As such efforts bear fruit, more numerous apprenticeship opportunities are expected to open to minority as well as other youth.

The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the U.S. Department of Labor works with employers and unions in establishing and improving apprenticeship and other on-the-job training programs in industry. The Bureau employs four minority consultants who concern themselves with problems of Negro workers. In New York City, Atlanta, Chicago, and San Francisco they confer with unions and employer groups to persuade them to accept Negroes as apprentices. They work to disseminate among minority groups information on the training and on-the-job requirements of skilled occupations, and to interest young Negroes in apprenticeship.

VOTING RIGHTS

In addition to actions to insure fair employment practices in Government work, the Federal Government has taken certain steps to assure equal protection of the laws in other fields. Federal Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960, though touching other subjects, particularly emphasized the maintenance of voting rights.

The 15th Amendment to the Constitution, adopted in 1870, states:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.
>
> The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Congress passed a Civil Rights Act in 1957, and another in April 1960 supplementing the 1957 act and entering certain new fields.

1957 Civil Rights Act

The 1957 act has three main provisions:

1. It established a Commission on Civil Rights, to be appointed by the President. This Commission was designed as an independent agency, empowered to study, investigate, appraise, and make recommendations. Specifically, it was directed to investigate sworn allegations that citizens were being denied their right to vote and to have that vote counted, because of their race, color, religion, or national origin. Secondly, the Commission was charged with the responsibility of collecting information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of equal protection of the laws. Further, the Commission was to appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection. In September 1959 and again in September 1961, Congress extended the life of the Commission for an additional 2 years.

2. The Attorney General of the United States was empowered to seek court injunctions against interference with the voting rights of any individual. Prior to the 1957 act, the Attorney General was limited to bringing criminal proceedings. Usually these actions could only be used after the event, and therefore came too late to have any substantial effect. The injunctive relief provided for in the 1957 act was designed to remedy this situation.

3. A Civil Rights Division was established in the Department of Justice, to be headed by an Assistant Attorney General.

Through the enforcement of this legislation, over 1,300 previously registered Negroes have been restored to voting lists in one southern county alone.

1960 Civil Rights Act

The 1960 act, in the words of Attorney General William P. Rogers, "reaffirms the determination of the people of the United States that constitutionally protected rights shall be fully enjoyed by all citizens in all parts of the Nation." Briefly, it provides as follows:

1. Any attempt to obstruct any court order is a punishable offense. This provision is not limited to civil rights.

2. The Federal Bureau of Investigation is authorized to investigate bombings of any buildings where it is reasonably believed that the guilty party has fled across a State line.

3. State election officials are required to retain voting records for a period of 22 months. This is to allow inspection of records of Federal elections and primaries by the Department of Justice. The Attorney General has served demands for examination of voting records on election officials of several southern counties, pursuant to this section.

4. Free public education may be arranged by the Commissioner of Education for children of Armed Forces members when the public schools in a given area have been closed by State or local authorities.

5. Probably the most important provision establishes additional machinery to insure the right of all qualified citizens to vote. It was this section, providing for the appointment of Federal voting referees, that caused the greatest amount of congressional debate. The law provides that in proceedings instituted under the 1957 act alleging denial, because of race or color, of the right to vote or the right to have the ballot counted, if a Federal district court finds the denial to be pursuant to a pattern or practice, the court may appoint a voting referee. The referee is to determine whether any voting applicant of the race or color discriminated against is qualified to vote under the State law; with affirmative findings, the court may issue a certificate declaring that right, and the citizen must then be allowed to vote.

In June 1960, the Attorney General filed in a Louisiana district court the first Federal suit under this newest civil rights law. The suit charged that denial of voting rights to Negroes in Bienville Parish constituted an officially sanctioned pattern of racial discrimination. Many other suits have since been filed; they have generally been successful.

For further information, see: (1) The Library of Congress, Legislative Reference Service, American Law Division, *Civil Rights Project—Report U.S. No. 1: Provisions of the Constitution, Statutes, and Executive Orders and Regulations of the United States Relating to the Infringement of Civil Rights on the Basis of Race, Religion, Color or National Origin.* August 19, 1958, 117 pp. (processed). See also: (2) U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *1961 Report,* Vol. 1, *Voting.* 1961, 380 pp.

HOUSING

The general picture in housing, as in other fields, shows Negroes in a less advantageous position than whites, but improving their situation faster on the whole. The housing field presents special problems, however.

Housing discrimination is common in the North as well as the South. One instrument which has been used is the restrictive covenant, an agreement on the part of a group of homeowners not to sell to members of certain racial or religious groups. Such agreements cannot, however, be enforced through the courts. The U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 1948 that neither State nor Federal courts might enforce racial or religious covenants; and in 1953, that courts might not award damages for breach of such covenants. Even though not legally enforceable, however, restrictive or evasionary agreements are believed still to exist and to influence the housing market.

Sixteen States and a number of cities specifically prohibit discrimination in public housing, in housing built with Government aid, or both (table 13, p. 13). Nine States have gone further by instructing commissions to prevent discrimination in the sale, rental, or occupancy of purely private as well as publicly assisted housing. New York City and Pittsburgh have taken similar action affecting private housing.

Despite discrimination, Negro housing has improved, largely owing to the rise in Negroes' incomes. Provision of new low-rent public housing has been of some assistance also.

Negro ownership of homes has become more extensive. In 1940, only about 24 percent of nonwhite families lived in homes they owned, compared with 46 percent of white families (table 14). By 1960, the rates had risen to 38 and 64 percent. The 1940–50 decade was a period of active home buying, especially for nonwhites. Nonwhites in nonfarm areas doubled their home ownership in 10 years (while their total number of occupied dwelling units in the nonfarm areas rose 36 percent). During the 1950's, although home buying was less extensive, nonwhites increased their home ownership by nearly 50 percent. The total rise in the two decades was well over 150 percent; the number of nonwhites increased 48 percent in that time.

TABLE 14.—*Owner-occupied dwelling units, by color, total and nonfarm, 1940-60*

Color of occupant	Percent of dwellings owner-occupied			Percent increase in owner-occupied units		
	1940	1950	1960	1940-50	1950-60	1940-60
All units:						
Total	43.6	55.0	61.9	55.0	39.2	115.8
White	45.7	57.0	64.4	54.3	38.6	113.8
Nonwhite	23.6	34.9	38.4	69.6	49.6	153.8
Nonfarm units:						
Total	41.1	53.4	61.0	73.5	52.3	164.3
White	42.7	55.0	63.4	72.1	51.3	160.4
Nonwhite	23.9	35.2	38.4	101.4	69.3	241.0

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Negroes live in more crowded quarters than whites (table 15). The situation for both has been improving, but as whites have moved to a greater extent out of the central city into the suburbs, they have succeeded better in obtaining more space for the family. By 1960, there were 3.7 nonwhites per dwelling unit in urban areas, 3.2 whites per unit. Nonwhites' rural homes, also, were more crowded. To the extent, furthermore, that Negro dwellings are smaller, with fewer rooms than those of whites, the difference is greater than is shown by these figures.

TABLE 15.—*Population per occupied dwelling unit, by color of occupants, urban and rural, 1940-60*

	Total	White	Nonwhite
United States:			
1940	3.8	3.7	4.1
1950	3.4	3.3	3.9
1960	3.4	3.3	4.0
Urban:			
1940	3.6	3.6	3.7
1950	3.2	3.2	3.6
1960	3.3	3.2	3.7
Rural nonfarm:			
1940	3.8	3.8	4.0
1950	3.4	3.4	4.0
Rural farm:			
1940	4.3	4.2	4.7
1950	4.0	3.9	5.0
Rural farm and nonfarm, 1960	3.7	3.6	4.8

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1960 figures include Alaska and Hawaii.

PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION

By mid-1962, 28 States and the District of Columbia (table 13, p. 16) had enacted enforceable laws forbidding discrimination in places of public accommodation. (This generally means places open to the public; most such places are privately owned.) The local areas which had such laws are: St. Louis, Mo., Baltimore and Montgomery County, Md., Wilmington, Del., and El Paso, Tex.

Such a law usually applies to a list of types of accommodation such as hotels, restaurants, beauty parlors, taxis, buses, theatres, parks, and beaches. Connecticut ascribes improved observance to a campaign of education conducted by its Commission on Civil Rights. In other instances, minority rights have been confirmed by court decision. In communities in which social pressure reinforces the law, desegregation has proceeded with little difficulty.

EDUCATION

Public Elementary and Secondary Schools

In education, as in other fields, statistics show Negroes still below the levels reached by whites, but gaining rapidly. In 1940, a greater proportion of white than of nonwhite children aged 7 to 13 were in school—95.5 and 91.2, respectively. By 1960, virtually all of both groups were in school (table 16). Thus, future generations of high school and college age will not show the discrepancies that have characterized whites and nonwhites in the past. From age 14 on, the percentage of nonwhites in school is smaller than the percentage of whites, but for the nonwhites this percentage rose sharply from 1940 to 1960.

TABLE 16.—*Percent of whites and nonwhites enrolled in school, by age, 1940, 1956, and 1960*

Age	April 1940		October 1956		October 1960	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Total, 7-24	59.7	55.3	73.8	69.9	75.1	72.8
7-13	95.5	91.2	99.4	98.4	99.6	99.1
14-17	80.7	68.2	89.2	81.2	90.8	86.8
18-24	13.8	9.1	20.1	15.8	21.8	15.9
18-19	29.8	21.1	35.9	31.8	38.9	34.6
20-24	6.9	3.8	13.4	8.7	13.9	7.5

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

The narrowing gap between white and nonwhite is further reflected in the average number of years of school completed (table 17). Nonwhite men aged 25 and over averaged less than 8 years' schooling in 1959, compared with an average of 11 years for whites. But the younger nonwhite men, aged 25 to 29, had averaged nearly 11 years' schooling, compared with 12½ years for whites. The 25- to 29-year-old nonwhite men in 1959 had 4.4 years more schooling than those of the same age in 1940; for whites, the average was 2 years higher.

TABLE 17.—*Median years of school completed by persons 25 years old and over, and 25 to 29 years old, by color and sex, 1940 to 1959*

Date and age	Male		Female	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
25 years and over				
April 1940	8.7	5.4	8.8	6.1
April 1947	9.0	6.6	9.7	7.2
October 1952	10.1	6.8	10.8	7.4
March 1957	10.7	7.3	11.3	8.1
March 1959	11.1	7.6	11.6	8.4
Increase, 1940 to 1959, in years completed	2.4	2.2	2.8	2.3
25 to 29 years				
April 1940	10.5	6.5	10.9	7.5
March 1957	12.3	9.4	12.3	10.3
March 1959	12.5	10.9	12.4	11.0
Increase, 1940 to 1959, in years completed	2.0	4.4	1.5	3.5

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

In the South in 1950, 1 out of 5 Negro men reaching the age of 20 or 21 had left school before completing the fifth year, compared with 1 out of 20 Negro men of this age elsewhere in the country. The 1950 southern rate, however, represented a notable improvement in basic literacy in a generation. Of the southern Negro men aged 40 to 45 years in 1950, only half had completed as much as 5 years of school. Since farm children have traditionally spent fewer years at school than city children, the comparatively high dropout rate in the South, and the improvement recorded, may reflect in part both the extent to which Negroes are still concentrated in rural areas of the South (table 4) and the movement of large numbers into southern cities.

School Expenditures. Many of the southern States, which have proportionately large numbers of Negro children, maintain two sets of schools, one for each race. These States also, in many cases, have incomes below the national average. Thus, although a number of the southern States have for years expended a larger share of their incomes on education than have many northern States, southern expenditure per pupil has generally remained below the national average. Traditionally, also, southern States have spent relatively less on the education of Negro than of white children.

Statistics indicate that both gaps are being closed. Many southern States have raised their instruction expenditures faster than the U.S. averages; and all those for which we have estimates have raised expenditures faster for Negro than for white schools (table 18). Whereas in the 1952–53 school year only North Carolina, among these States, spent more than 90 percent as much per child on Negro as on white pupils, by 1956–57 four more had reached that point. This was accomplished through special efforts spent on Negro schools. The Mississippi effort is notable: the expenditure rate for Negro schools in 1956–57—although still only 61 percent as high as for white schools—had doubled in 4 years.

U.S. data are not available for the same periods. Figures for other recent years suggest, however, that although southern States, almost without exception, still spent less per pupil than the U.S. average, southern expenditures were rising more rapidly.[5]

TABLE 18.—*Estimated expenditure for instruction per pupil in average daily attendance in white and Negro public elementary and secondary schools, selected States, school years 1952–53 and 1956–57*

State	1952–53			1956–57			Percent increase	
	White	Negro	Negro as percent of white	White	Negro	Negro as percent of white	White	Negro
North Carolina	$133.87	$126.80	94.7	$137.76	$130.63	94.8	2.9	3.0
South Carolina	121.64	83.67	68.8	143.33	110.33	77.0	17.8	31.9
Georgia	127.89	108.80	85.1	151.04	141.53	93.7	18.1	30.1
Florida	160.40	145.13	90.5	[1] 195.66	[1] 183.72	[1] 93.9	22.0	26.6
Alabama	108.59	95.59	88.0	138.56	132.36	95.5	27.6	38.5
Mississippi	98.49	39.12	39.7	128.51	78.67	61.2	30.5	101.1
Arkansas	91.66	62.11	67.8	106.53	80.17	75.3	16.2	29.1
Louisiana	160.21	113.67	71.0	211.94	166.83	78.7	32.2	46.8
Texas	175.42	133.44	76.1	204.75	190.34	93.0	16.7	42.6

[1] 1955–56.

NOTE.—The cost of instruction includes salaries, free text books, teaching supplies, school library books, and other instructional supplies and expenses.

Source: Patrick McCauley and Edward D. Ball, *Southern Schools: Progress and Problems.* Nashville, Southern Education Reporting Service, 1959, p. 115.

Desegregation of Public Schools. States that maintained segregated public elementary and high schools were affected by Supreme Court decisions of 1954 holding that "in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place," since "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal," and that "segregation in public education is not reasonably related to any proper governmental objective." [6] In 1955, the Supreme Court further held that "a prompt and reasonable start" must be made on the process of desegregation; but that once such a start had been made, in good faith, additional time to carry out the ruling might be allowed if the courts considered it necessary. Desegregation was to proceed, the Court ordered, "with all deliberate speed." [7]

In effect, every variety of compliance and noncompliance with these decisions can be found in 1962. (See table 13, p. 16 for overall view. The District of Columbia is counted in the following paragraphs

[5] Average instruction expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance in U.S. public elementary and secondary schools were:

1951–52	$162.61
1953–54	177.52
1955–56	198.34
1957–58	232.18
1959–60	257.13

The percentage increases during 4-year periods in the United States were:

1951–52 to 1955–56	22.0
1953–54 to 1957–58	30.8

U.S. data are from the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

[6] *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 495 (1954); *Bolling* v. *Sharpe*, 347 U.S. 497 (1954).

[7] *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka*, 349 U.S. 294, 295 (1955).

as a State.) Thirty-three of the 51 States have long had integrated public schools, though before the Supreme Court decisions 4 States—Kansas, Arizona, New Mexico, and Wyoming—had permitted segregation on an optional basis; these statutes have since been repealed, or locally ruled invalid. Since the Supreme Court decisions, Washington, D.C., and larger cities in the border States have completely desegregated their public schools. Seven border States have integrated a substantial portion of the schools (table 13); seven have made a small beginning; in three others, no public school desegregation has occurred.

Despite the fact that laws in northern and western States did not require or permit segregation—indeed, many expressly forbade it—some segregated schools have been found there in recent years. Most segregation by deliberate policy, in these States, is believed to have been stopped; but since the Federal courts found a violation of the 14th Amendment in the operation of the schools of New Rochelle, N.Y., similar accusations have been made in 56 other cities in 14 northern and western States. By mid-1962, 20 suits had been filed in the courts. Two of these had been settled, and four had been dismissed for failure to exhaust State administrative remedies before filing suit. Charges include gerrymandering attendance zones; discriminatory transfer policies and practices, and feeder patterns of elementary to secondary schools; failure to utilize existing classroom space to relieve overcrowding in some schools; discrimination in site selection, in vocational and distributive education programs, and in the employment, assignment, and promotion of Negro teachers. Further court decisions are expected to clarify these issues.

In the 1960–61 school term, about 7 percent of the Negro public school children in 17 southern and border States and Washington, D.C., were at school with whites. As table 19 shows, less than half the school districts in these States had biracial populations (columns 1 and 2). A school in an entirely Negro or an entirely white residential area, though in principle desegregated, may actually serve only Negro or only white children; there are many such cases (see, e.g., figures for the District of Columbia, columns 5 and 7, table 19).

The half-million children living in districts that have been desegregated are largely in the border States, and particularly in the cities, such as Wilmington, Del., Baltimore, Washington, Louisville, St. Louis, and Kansas City, Mo.

Scores of antidesegregation laws have been adopted by southern legislatures since 1954. Such laws provide among other things for closing public schools, if necessary, to prevent their integration (and the schools of one district were closed); for assignment of pupils to specific schools as directed by the school board or other authority, with an apparent view to enabling school boards to maintain segregation; and for abolition of compulsory attendance requirements.

Court tests of such laws have been numerous. The grade-a-year desegregation plan has been found by courts, in some instances, to be too slow, and therefore invalid.

TABLE 19.—*Number of public school districts and public elementary and secondary school enrollment in southern and border States, 1960–61 school year*

State	School districts			Enrollment				
					Negroes			
							In desegregated schools	
	Total	Biracial	Desegregated, May 1961	Total	Total	As percent of total enrolled	Number	As percent of Negroes enrolled
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Total	6,664	2,839	775	13,261,660	3,088,261	23.3	213,560	6.9
Missouri	1,889	214	200	842,000	84,000	10.0	35,000	41.7
Delaware	93	51	24	81,603	14,973	18.3	6,783	45.3
Maryland	24	23	23	598,088	136,882	22.9	45,943	33.6
District of Columbia	1	1	1	121,448	96,751	79.7	81,392	84.1
Virginia	130	128	11	879,500	211,000	24.0	208	(1)
West Virginia	55	43	43	437,656	21,010	4.8	14,000	66.6
North Carolina	173	173	10	1,140,000	307,800	27.0	82	(1)
South Carolina	108	108	0	612,894	258,667	42.2	0	0
Georgia	198	196	0	921,632	295,255	32.0	0	0
Florida	67	67	1	1,019,792	212,280	20.8	27	(1)
Kentucky	211	171	128	635,432	41,938	6.6	16,329	38.9
Tennessee	154	143	6	828,000	152,352	18.4	376	.2
Alabama	114	114	0	787,269	271,134	34.4	0	0
Mississippi	151	151	0	566,421	278,640	49.2	0	0
Arkansas	422	228	10	422,183	105,130	24.9	113	.1
Louisiana	67	67	1	693,202	271,021	39.1	1	(1)
Oklahoma	1,276	241	189	545,000	40,875	7.5	9,806	24.0
Texas	1,531	720	128	2,129,540	288,553	13.6	3,500	1.2

[1] Less than one-tenth of 1 percent.

NOTE.—As enrollment data are for the 1960–61 school year, they do not show changes in the fall of 1961, including the beginning of desegregation in Georgia. Fall 1961 changes are reflected in table 13, p. 16.

Source: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *1961 Report*, Vol. 2, *Education*, pp. 236, 238. Data are based in part on *Southern School News*, published by the Southern Education Reporting Service, Nashville, Tenn.

Higher Education

After a series of lawsuits, Negroes began to be admitted, in the 1930's, to some formerly all-white public institutions of higher education in southern States. Integration at the college level, which thus began before the U.S. Supreme Court's 1954 decision, has proceeded faster than desegregation in the lower schools. In several States, a court order granting the petition of a Negro student for admittance to the previously all-white State university was followed by quick desegregation of other tax-supported institutions. In some States, private institutions had taken action first; in others, they slowly followed the lead of the public schools. In most States, desegregation began at the graduate level and was extended later to undergraduates. Some institutions have remained all-white or all-

Negro despite the State's policy of integration, having received no applications from members of the other race.

Negroes have taken increasing advantage of growing opportunities for higher education. From 1947 to 1961, the number of nonwhites in colleges or professional schools rose at a much faster rate than the number of whites. (See table 20. The differences in rates of increase between 1947–53 and 1953–61 result mainly from differences in the population of college age, attributable to earlier variations in the birth rate.)

In spite of growing opportunity, however, proportionately fewer Negroes than whites go on to advanced university study. The reasons, which are many, include the poorer economic status of Negro families, family influence, lack of motivation, inadequate counseling, and also the poorer primary and secondary schools usually maintained for Negroes in States having segregated systems, schools which do not offer adequate preparation for college.

For data on higher education in specific States, see: U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, *Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education, 1960*, and *1961 Report*, Vol. 2, *Education*, Chapter 11.

TABLE 20.—*Enrollment in college or professional school, 1947–61*

Year	White	Nonwhite
	Number	
1947	2,187,000	[1] 124,000
1953	2,249,000	128,000
1961 [2]	3,498,000	233,000
	Percent increase	
1947–61	60.0	87.9
1947–53	2.8	3.2
1953–61	55.5	82.0

[1] Estimated.
[2] Includes Alaska and Hawaii 1947 and 1953 figures do not.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE:1962